	Case 3:07-cv-03604-JSW	Document 3	Filed 12/12/2007	Page 1 of 4						
1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR. Attorney General of the State of California									
2	DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General									
3	GERALD A. ENGLER Senior Assistant Attorney General									
4	Supervising Deputy Attorney General									
5	Deputy Attorney General									
6	455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000									
7	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 703-5847									
8	Fax: (415) 703-1234 E-mail: Allen.Crown@doj.	.ca.gov								
9	Attorneys for Respondent									
10										
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
12	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA									
13 14	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION									
15	MARCUS JAMES HOOKS, C 07-3604 JSW (PR)									
16	WINCOS STATES HOOK	•		WER TO ORDER TO						
17	v.		· ·	W CAUSE						
18	WARDEN OF AVENAL STATE PRISON,									
19										
20										
21	Respondent provides this answer to the Order to Show Cause why the petition for writ of									
22	habeas corpus should not be granted.									
23	I.									
24	CUSTODY									
25	Petitioner is lawfully in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and									
26	Rehabilitation as the result of a judgment of conviction in Santa Clara County in Case No.									
27	CC448196.									
28	On April 22, 2005, the District Attorney filed an amended information in Santa Clara									
	Oli April 22, 2003,	the District Attorn	cy med an amend							
	Answer To Order To Show Cause - I		6604 JSW (PR)							

///

County Superior Court accusing petitioner, Marcus James Hooks, as follows: count one, concealing an event affecting the right to an insurance benefit in violation of California Penal Code § 550(b)(3); count two, presenting a fraudulent insurance claim in violation of § 550(a)(1); and count three, preparing a false insurance claim in violation of § 550(a)(5). It was further alleged that during the commission of the above offenses petitioner was out of custody on bail on felony insurance fraud, a violation of § 550(a)(1), within the meaning of § 12022.1. It was also alleged that petitioner had been convicted of two prior felony convictions for which he had served prison terms within the meaning of § 667.5(b). 1 CT 124-27.

On May 11, 2005, petitioner admitted the further allegation enhancements. 1 CT 164.

On May 18, 2005, a jury found petitioner not guilty of count one and guilty of counts two and three. 1 CT 191-96.

On June 15, 2005, petitioner was sentenced to state prison for a term of five years consecutive to a prior prison term of five years, for a total prison term of ten years, as follows: one year consisting of one-third of the midterm for count two, plus two years under § 12022.1, plus two years consisting of one year for each prior felony conviction enhancement under § 667.5(b). The midterm sentence for count three was stayed under § 654. 1 CT 238-40, 243A-C.

On September 28, 2006, the California Court of Appeal, Sixth Appellate District, affirmed the judgment. Exh. F.

On January 17, 2007, the California Supreme Court denied petitioner's petition for review. Exh. H.

On June 21, 2007, petitioner filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

On June 28, 2007, that Court ordered the petition transferred to this Court.

On November 20, 2007, this Court issued an order to show cause.

1. Unspecified statutory references are to the California Penal Code.

	Case 3:07-cv-03604-JSW Document 3 Filed 12/12/2007 Page 3 of 4								
1	II.								
2	VERIFICATION								
3	Petitioner signed but did not verify the petition.								
4	III.								
5	GENERAL AND SPECIFIC DENIALS								
6	Respondent denies that the state court's rulings were based on unreasonable								
7	determinations of facts or were contrary to or involved an unreasonable application of clearly								
8	established United States Supreme Court law. Respondent specifically denies petitioner's claims								
9	as follows: one, the trial court denied petitioner his right to present a defense by excluding evidence								
10	of insurance industry practices; two, the court's failure to provide accurate instructions on the								
11	elements of the crime violated petitioner's rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth								
12	Amendments; three, trial counsel was ineffective under the Sixth Amendment; and four, cumulative								
13	error.								
14	IV.								
15	PROCEDURAL ISSUES								
16	Petitioner exhausted state remedies for his claims that are contained in the petition.								
17	Petitioner filed his petition within the one-year statute of limitations period set by 28 U.S.C. §								
18	2244(d). Petitioner's claim that he was denied the right to present a defense is procedurally								
19	defaulted.								
20	V.								
21	LODGED DOCUMENTS								
22	Respondent is lodging concurrently with this answer the following exhibits:								
23	EXHIBIT A Clerk's Transcript (1 vol.), <i>People v. Hooks</i> , Santa Clara County Case No.								

Clerk's Transcript (1 vol.), People v. Hooks, Santa Clara County Case No. EXHIBIT A CC448196.

EXHIBIT B Reporter's Transcript (4 vols.), *People v. Hooks*, Santa Clara County Case No. CC448196.

Appellant's Opening Brief, People v. Hooks, California Court of Appeal Case EXHIBIT C No. H028971.

**EXHIBIT D** Respondent's Brief, People v. Hooks, California Court of Appeal Case No. H028971.

Answer To Order To Show Cause - Hooks v. Warden, C 07-3604 JSW (PR)

24

25

26

27

28

	Case 3:07-cv-036	04-JSW	Document 3	Filed 12/12/2007	Page 4 of 4				
1 2	EXHIBIT E Appellant's Reply Brief, <i>People v. Hooks</i> , California Court of Appeal Case No. H028971.								
3	EXHIBIT F Opinion, <i>People v. Hooks</i> , California Court of Appeal Case No. H028971.								
4	EXHIBIT G	IBIT G Petition For Review, <i>People v. Hooks</i> , California Supreme Court Case No. S147629.							
5	EXHIBIT H	Denial Of Review, <i>People v. Hooks</i> , California Supreme Court Case No. S147629.							
6	VI.								
7	INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE								
8	Respondent hereby incorporates by reference the accompanying memorandum of points								
9	and authorities in support of this answer.								
10									
11	CONCLUSION								
12	Respondent respectfully requests that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be denied with								
13	prejudice.								
14	Dated: December 12, 2007								
15	Respectfully submitted,								
16									
17	Attorney General of the State of California								
18	DANE R. GILLETTE Chief Assistant Attorney General								
19	GERALD A. ENGLER Senior Assistant Attorney General								
20	PEGGY S. RUFFRA Supervising Deputy Attorney General								
21			1 0						
22			/s/ Allen R. Cro ALLEN R. CR	OWN					
23			Deputy Attorned Attorneys for F	•					
24			·	•					
25									
26									
27									
28									
	Answer To Order To Sl	now Cause -	Hooks v. Warden. C 0	7-3604 JSW (PR)					